UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,856	12/18/2000	Jason M. Allor	205728	4196

23460 7590 11/29/2004

LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780

EXAMINER	
CHUONG, TRUC T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/739,856	Applicant(s) ALLOR ET AL.	
	Examiner Truc T Chuong	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 September 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15 and 27-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15 and 27-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment C, filed 09/01/04.

2. Claims 1-15 and 27-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 10 are independent claims. In Amendment C, claims 1 and 10 are amended. This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-15, and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Weinberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,962) in view of Lowry (U.S. Patent No. 953,724).

As to claim 1, Weinberg teaches a computer-implemented method for making resources available, the method comprising:

presenting a hierarchy comprising a plurality of nodes (hierarchical tree, e.g., col. 2 lines 35-37, and figs. 2-5), the first hierarchy based, at least in part, on a first organization (grouping and access methods, col. 19 lines 56-64, and each node can represent an application, email, video file, or Java Applet, e.g., col. 8 lines 40-50), wherein at least one of the nodes represents resources for performing tasks (e.g., col. 2 lines 12-14, col. 8 lines 40-50);

presenting a link group associated with at least one of the nodes (children and parents nodes, e.g., col. 2 lines 37-48, and figs. 5-6) wherein the link group comprises one or more links through which to open files or execute programs to access the resources and accomplish at least one of the tasks (each node represents a respective content object such as: Java applets, mail messages, audio/video files, and applications, e.g., col. 8 lines 32-50, and launching an application, e.g., col. 10 lines 16-34); and

presenting a second hierarchy comprising a plurality of nodes, the second hierarchy based, at least in part, on a second organization, the second organization distinct from the first organization (figs. 13-15 show a search result with a parent node and its children from an infoseek web page are distinctly displayed from other web sites as mentioned in figs. 1-6 above, and e.g., col. 25 lines 58-65), the second organization also distinct from a parent/child organization of nodes (Weinberg inherently (but not clearly) teaches this limitation; for example, if the user would like to open another search engine beside the infoseek such as yahoo, google, or others, (s)he can open yahoo and inforseek at the same time, and they clearly distinct from the other because there is no relationships/node connections/hierarchical relationships between these two search engines); however, if Weinberg does not teach the limitation, it is well known and would have been obvious to modify the system of Weinberg in view of Lowry, which clearly shows the nodes distinct from the parent/child of the nodes (figs. 2B and 5A disclose the nodes without any relationship), to help the user to differentiate the types of information from different organizations (Abstract).

As to claim 2, Weinberg teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 (software package "Astra" runs on a client computer, e.g., col. 7 lines 48-54).

As to claim 3, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the link group is extensible to allow a plurality of users to add links and thereby add to the available resources (add a dataset to the current URL, e.g., col. 25 lines 9).

As to claim 4, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: organizing the resources into functional areas; representing each functional area by a node of the plurality; and, receiving a user selection of at least one of the nodes (Astra Graphical User Interface, e.g., col. 15 lines 40-67, col. 16 lines 1-39, and figs. 3-5, 19, 21), wherein the one or more links of the presented link group are usable to open files or execute programs to access resources of the functional area represented by the selected node (e.g., col. 8 lines 40-50, and fig. 14).

As to claim 5, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the presented link group comprises a link to a web site regarding the functional area represented by the selected node (e.g., col. 8 lines 40-50, and fig. 14).

As to claim 6, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the presented link group comprises a link to a document regarding the functional area (e.g., col. 8 lines 40-50).

As to claim 7, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the presented link group comprises a link to set up an email to a person responsible for the functional area (mail message, e.g., col. 8 lines 46-50).

As to claim 8, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 4, wherein the presented link group comprises a link to a software useful in performing work in the functional area (filter bar, e.g., col. 16 lines 21-39).

As to claim 9, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the hierarchy is a tree, wherein the node to which the link group is associated is a child node, and wherein at least one of the plurality of nodes is a parent of the child node (e.g., figs. 2, 5, and 6).

As to claim 10, Weinberg teaches a method for enabling a plurality of users to collaborate on a project, the method comprising:

presenting a first graphical hierarchy having a plurality of nodes (hierarchical tree, e.g., col. 2 lines 35-37, and figs. 2-5), the first graphical hierarchy based, at least in part, on a first organization (grouping and access methods, col. 19 lines 56-64, and each node can represent an application, email, video file, or Java Applet, e.g., col. 8 lines 40-50), each node representing one or more sub-projects into which the project is divided (the relationships between parent nodes and children nodes show as hierarchical data structure displays, e.g., col. 2 lines 27-48);

in response to user selection of a node of the plurality, presenting one or more links, wherein the links are selectable to open files or execute programs for use by one or more of the plurality of users to contribute to the one or more sub-projects represented by the selected node (see claim 1 and e.g., col. 8 lines 40-50, figs. 2, 5, and 6); and

presenting a second graphical hierarchy comprising a plurality of nodes, the second hierarchy based, at least in part, on a second organization, the second organization distinct form the first organization (figs. 13-15 show a search result with a parent node and its children from an inforseek web page are distinctly displayed from other web sites as mentioned in figs. 1-6

above, and e.g., col. 25 lines 58-65); the second organization also distinct from a parent/child organization of nodes (Weinberg inherently (but not clearly) teaches this limitation; for example, if the user would like to open another search engine beside the infoseek such as yahoo, google, or others, (s)he can open yahoo and inforseek at the same time, and they clearly distinct from the other because there is no relationships/node connections/hierarchical relationships between these two search engines); however, if Weinberg does not teach the limitation, it is well known and would have been obvious to modify the system of Weinberg in view of Lowry, which clearly shows the nodes distinct from the parent/child of the nodes (figs. 2B and 5A disclose the nodes without any relationship), to help the user to differentiate the types of information from different organizations/nodes (Abstract).

As to claim 11, it is individually similar in scope to claim 2 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 12, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 10, further comprising: displaying at least one representation of a task associated with a node of the plurality of nodes (figs. 14 and 19); displaying at least one representation of a computer that is to be used to work on the project (figs. 19 and 21), wherein the computer has a work queue (Link Doctor of fig. 22); and, in response to a user of the plurality moving the task representation to the computer representation, adding the represented task to the work queue of the represented computer (Edit, e.g., col. 31 lines 14-24, and fig. 22).

As to claim 13, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 10, further comprising: displaying at least one representation of a task associated with a node of the plurality of nodes (see claim 12 above); displaying at least one representation of a user of the plurality of users (Weinberg shows

plurality of users (Internet and World Wide Web, e.g., col. 5 lines 23-27, and col. 5 lines 57-65), wherein the represented user has a work queue; and, in response to a transfer of the task representation to the user representation, adding the represented task to the work queue of the represented user (see claim 12 above).

As to claim 14, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the graphical hierarchy is a tree, and is presented in a first pane of a user interface (col. 2 lines 35-37, and fig. 6), and wherein the links are presented in a second pane of the user interface (Pan Window, e.g., col. 17 lines 21-39, and fig. 5).

As to claim 15, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 12, wherein the graphical hierarchy is a tree, and is presented in a first pane of a user interface, the links are presented in a second pane of the user interface (see claim 14 above), and the work queue is represented in a third pane of the user interface (e.g., figs. 5 and 22).

As to claim 27, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first organization is selected from the group consisting of: by resource category, by functional area, by project, and by task grouping (grouping and access methods, e.g., col. 19 lines 56-64).

As to claim 29, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 10, wherein at least one of the node represent a set of software tests (TABLE 2 shows how to generate a test script, e.g., col. 18 lines 13-35).

As to claim 28, Weinberg teaches the method of claim 1, wherein at least one of the nodes (or content objects) represents mail messages, Java Applets, image files, and Applications; however, Weinberg does not clearly show that a node represent an employee. Examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art, an employee (or user) of a Network System can be

represented by an icon or node in order to have better communications among employees in a same Network System.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed in Amendment C have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued and Examiner disagrees the followings:

a. Weinberg is limited to presenting a hierarchy of hyperlinks in and among web sites.

Examiner does not agree because Weinberg clearly mentions that the hierarchical structure of nodes is not just only for listing the web sites but each of the nodes is also represented for an application, email, video file, Java Applet, etc. (e.g., col. 8 lines 40-50).

b. Weinberg's nodes are always organized in a strict parent/child relationship.

Weinberg clearly shows a parent node and its children from an infoseek web page are distinctly displayed from other web sites as mentioned in figs. 1-6, and e.g., col. 25 lines 58-65; and with a similar method, if the user would like to open another search engine beside the infoseek such as yahoo, google, or others, (s)he can access yahoo and inforseek at the same time, and they clearly distinct from the other because there is no relationships/node connections/hierarchical relationships between these two search engines.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 571-272-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. Chuong

11/23/04

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100